

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-4

WASHINGTON TIMES
1 March 1984

Report says U.N. bureau does KGB's work

By Timothy Elder
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

U.S. taxpayers are helping to fund KGB propaganda operations directed through the United Nations information office against Western democracies and free enterprise, a report on the world body concludes.

The report was written for the Heritage Foundation by Roger A. Brooks, who heads the conservative research group's United Nations Assessment Project as a Roe Fellow in United Nations Studies.

Deputy U.N. Ambassador Charles M. Lichenstein told The Washington Times the report was "substantially on target" and called for the Congress and the Reagan administration to exercise tighter control over U.S. contributions to the U.N.

The United States provided \$16.3 million, or 25 percent, of the department's budget for 1982-83.

The U.N. Department of Public Information "betrays the original vision" of the U.N. and "has become a source of propaganda to further . . . anti-Western and anti-free enterprise ideology," according to the report.

The 19-page report quotes former

U.N. Undersecretary General Arkady Shevchenko as saying "the whole [Public Information] Department is mobilized" for the benefit of a disinformation campaign carried out by the Soviet Union through the U.N.

The top Soviet diplomat in the department, external relations division chief Anatoly Mkrichyan, who Mr. Shevchenko, who defected to the United States in 1978, has identified as a colonel in the KGB, directs the effort to influence the operations of the department toward Soviet interests, the report says.

An eight-page response issued by the United Nations does not attempt to address the charges against Mr. Mkrichyan.

"That would be very difficult for them to do, because we have assertions from other people familiar with the Soviet system that he is involved with the KGB," Mr. Brooks said after learning of the contents of the U.N. response.

The information department "is too often non-professional and tendentious in its work," Mr. Lichenstein said.

Although the department must act within guidelines issued by the General Assembly, "there is no directive to be biased, partial and tendentious," Mr. Lichenstein said.

Mr. Brooks outlined a number of abuses by the information department, including efforts to lobby Congress — in possible defiance of U.S. law — portraying Western industrialized democracies as frustrating U.N. efforts to attain its goals and the promotion of centrally planned economies as models for developing countries.

"Close cooperation with almost 30 national broadcasting organizations throughout the world and almost all major news organizations allows DPI to convey the distorted image of the world that is portrayed at the United Nations," the report says.

The "distorted image" includes "railing against violations of the human rights of Marxist 'liberation' groups while ignoring human rights violations throughout the Soviet empire, and promoting the economic development models of centrally planned economies to the exclusion of other models," the report says.

While such problems have been noted by a number of critics in other parts of the U.N. and its affiliate agencies, Mr. Brooks singled out the information department.

The "predominance" of such prob-

lems "in the work of the DPI may be far more damaging to the interests of the United States and its allies than even the problems of the General Assembly and its various committees," the report said.

The U.N. response attempted to rebut 22 specific charges made by the report — many involving charges of biased reporting. It did not, however, appear to address what many observers saw as the central charge of the report — that the department is unnecessarily biased against Western industrialized countries in its work.

"We should step up our monitoring of these [U.N.] activities . . . and ask ourselves — within the charter — how we might reduce our investment," Mr. Lichenstein said.

Mr. Lichenstein further charged that "budget increases for the DPI have run far ahead of increases for the rest of the secretariat" and said the department does not have an internal auditing system to assess the effectiveness of the projects it undertakes.

Mr. Lichenstein did not rule out the possibility that the United States — as a result of decisions by Congress or the administration — would withhold contributions from certain functions of the information department.